

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA**

United States of America,

Crim. No. 19-185 (SRN)

Plaintiff,

v.

ORDER ON REMAND

**Ronald Jermaine Jackson (01),
William Charles Graham (02),
Defendants**

Nathan Hoyer Nelson, Craig Baune, and William Mattessich, Office of the United States Attorney, 300 South Fourth Street, Suite 600, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55415, for Plaintiff United States of America

Ronald Jermaine Jackson, Reg. No. 22096-041, FCI Greenville, P.O. Box 5000, Greenville, IL 62246, Pro Se Defendant

William Charles Graham, Reg. No. 22097-041, FCI Greenville, P.O. Box 5000, Greenville, IL 62246, Pro Se Defendant

SUSAN RICHARD NELSON, United States District Judge

This matter is before the Court on remand from the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals, *United States v. Jackson*, No. 25-1418 (8th Cir. Mar. 3, 2025) [Doc. No. 829]; *United States v. Graham*, No. 25-1417 (8th Cir. Mar. 3, 2025) [Doc. No. 830], with instructions to determine whether Mr. Jackson and Mr. Graham are entitled to a certificate of appealability.

In this Court's February 10, 2025 Orders [Doc. Nos. 819 & 820], the Court considered Mr. Jackson and Mr. Brown's respective Pro Se Motions for Relief from Judgment Under Rule 60 [Doc. Nos. 817 & 818]. The Court denied both motions as

successive habeas petitions, filed without certification from the Eighth Circuit. (Feb. 10, 2025 Orders at 1, 5.) Subsequently, Mr. Jackson and Mr. Graham appealed the February 10, 2025 Orders to the Eighth Circuit [Doc. Nos. 821 & 822].

In order to appeal an adverse decision on a § 2255 motion, a movant must first obtain a certificate of appealability. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1)(B). A certificate of appealability cannot be granted unless the petitioner “has made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right.” 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). This Court has considered whether the issuance of a certificate is appropriate here and finds that the basis for dismissal set forth in the February 10, 2025 Orders—unauthorized successive habeas petitions—is not reasonably debatable. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c); *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484–85 (2000). Accordingly, because Mr. Jackson and Mr. Graham have failed to make a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right, the Court declines to issue a certificate of appealability.

Based on the submissions and the entire file and proceedings herein, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that

1. A Certificate of Appealability as to Defendant Ronald Jermaine Jackson’s Pro Se Motion for Relief from Judgment Under Rule 60 [Doc. No. 817] is **DENIED**.
2. A Certificate of Appealability as to Defendant William Charles Graham’s Pro Se Motion for Relief from Judgment Under Rule 60 [Doc. No. 818] is **DENIED**.

Dated: March 4, 2025

s/Susan Richard Nelson
SUSAN RICHARD NELSON
United States District Judge